CCSBT–CC/2010/12

Compliance Risks and Consideration of a Draft Compliance Action Plan for 2021 to 2025
遵守リスク及び 2021 年から 2025 年の遵守行動計画案の検討

1. Introduction
序論

The current three-year Compliance Action Plan (CAP) for 2018 to 2020[1] inclusive is part of the Compliance Plan and includes three components:
2018 年から 2020 年の期間を対象とする現行の 3 年間の遵守行動計画（CAP）[1]は、遵守計画の一部となっており、以下の 3 つのコンポーネントを含むものである。

- A list of compliance risks,
  遵守リスク一覧
- Table 1: Project action items, and
  表 1：プロジェクト行動事項
- Table 2: Annual ongoing maintenance action items.
  表 2：毎年の「維持管理」行動事項

In 2019, the Fourteenth Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC14) recommended that the Compliance Action Plan (CAP) become a five-year plan from 2021 onwards, with the caveat that it is reviewed rigorously on an annual basis as part of a standing agenda item and is as such considered to be "a living document".
2019 年の第 14 回遵守委員会（CCSBT）会合は、遵守行動計画（CAP）について、常設議題項目の一部として毎年徹底的にレビューすること及びこれ故に「生きた文書」と見なすことを条件に、2021 年以降は 5 年間の CAP とすることを勧告した。

This paper considers a proposed new five-year CAP for 2021 to 2025 including reporting back on the following items:
本文書では、2021 年から 2025 年までを対象とする新たな 5 年間の CAP 案（以下の事項に関する報告を含む）について検討する。

- The annual standing item agreed by the Twelfth meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC12) for the Secretariat to review the list of compliance risks and consider emerging risks[2], as well as to report on what has been done to mitigate or better quantify those risks, and
  事務局は遵守リスクの一覧をレビューし、及び新たに出現しつつあるリスクについて検討する[2]とともに、これらのリスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化の

[1] Refer to pages 9-18 of the CCSBT Compliance Plan CCSBT 遵守計画の 9-18 ページを参照

[2] Refer to paragraph 104 of CC12's report　CC 12 報告書パラグラフ 104 を参照

ために為された内容を報告することとして第 12 回遵守委員会（CC 12）会合により合意された年次常設議題項目

- Two CC14 recommendations endorsed by CCSBT 26:
  CCSBT 26 により承認された CC 14 による 2 つの勧告
  - *That the Secretariat will lead an intersessional email group that will work towards developing a draft Compliance Action Plan for consideration by CC 15. Nominations for participants will be sought from Members intersessionally*[3]*,*
    CC 15 において検討する遵守行動計画案の作成に向けて作業を行う休会期間中の電子メールグループを事務局がリードすること。メンバーに対しては、休会期間中に同グループへの参加者の指名が要請される予定である。[3]
  - *Establish and convene an intersessional correspondence group to develop the new CAP and work on suggested actions and timing, including consideration of progress with regard to mitigation and better quantification of current compliance risks (2020 Workplan item – Secretariat and Members)*[4]*.*
    新たな CAP を策定するための休会期間中の連絡グループを設立及び招集し、行動事項及びタイミングを提案するための作業（現行の遵守リスクの緩和及びより良い定量化に関する進捗状況の検討を含む）を行う（2020 年作業計画事項 – メンバー及び事務局）[4]

2. 2020 CAP Intersessional Correspondence Group
2020 年 CAP に関する休会期間中の連絡グループ

During 2020, the Secretariat's Compliance Manager coordinated the work of the CAP intersessional correspondence group with its key goal being to develop a draft CAP for 2021 to 2025 inclusive.
2020 年中、事務局のコンプライアンス・マネージャーは、2021 年から 2025 年の期間の CAP 案を作成することを重要目標とする「CAP に関する休会期間中の連絡グループ」の調整を行った。

Intersessional Correspondence Group Process
休会期間中の連絡グループのプロセス

The intersessional process involved the following steps:
休会期間中のプロセスでは以下のようなステップをとった。

- January/ February:
  1 月／2 月：
  The Secretariat sought and received nominations for intersessional group members;
  事務局は、休会期間中の連絡グループのメンバーを募集し、推薦を受けた。

- March:
  3 月：
  The Secretariat advised the group of confirmed nominations received;
  事務局は、グループに対して確認された参加者を通知した。

- May:
  5 月：
  The Secretariat initiated the consultation process by circulating background

[3] Paragraph 87 of the CC14 report CC 14 報告書パラグラフ 87 を参照

[4] Paragraph 101 of the CC14 report CC 14 報告書パラグラフ 101 を参照

information as well as three proposed revised documents for group members to comment on by 26 June 2020:
事務局は、グループメンバーに対して背景情報並びに以下の 3 つの文書改定案を回章し、2020 年 6 月 26 日までのコメントを求める形で協議プロセスを開始した。

1. Proposed revised list of compliance risks;
   遵守リスク一覧の改定案
2. Proposed project action items for 2021 – 2025; and
   2021－2025 年のプロジェクト行動事項案
3. Proposed maintenance action items for 2021- 2025;
   2021－2025 年の「維持管理」行動事項案

- June/ July:
  6 月／7 月：
  Responses on documents 1 to 3 above were received from Australia, the EU, Japan, New Zealand and Taiwan.
  上記 1 から 3 までの文書案に対し、オーストラリア、EU、日本、ニュージーランド及び台湾から回答を得た。
  Korea advised that, "*The proposed changes/additions seem reasonable and appropriate, and we don't have any specific comments at this stage*"; and
  韓国は「*提案された修正／追加案は合理的かつ適切であると思われ、現段階では特段のコメントはない*」とした。

- August:
  8 月：
  - The Secretariat collated the responses received and contacted group members with relevant queries and clarifications where relevant. Members' suggestions and proposed revisions were then incorporated into a further revision of each of the attachments 1 – 3 above, provided as **Attachments A, B and C** to this paper, and
    事務局は、受領した回答をとりまとめ、関連する質問及び明確化のためにグループメンバーと連絡をとった。その後、メンバーからの提案及び修正案を上記の別紙 1－3 それぞれに取り入れ、本文書の**別紙 A**、**B** 及び **C** に示した。
  - The Secretariat circulated a draft table summarising what has been done to mitigate or better quantify the existing (2018-20) list of compliance risks to the intersessional group members and requested comments. One minor comment was received.
    事務局は、休会期間中の連絡グループメンバーに対して既存（2018－2020 年）の遵守リスク一覧に掲載されたリスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化のために為された内容を総括した表の案を回章し、コメントを求めた。コメントが 1 件寄せられた。

Note about Comments Received
受領したコメントに関する注記

Australia and Japan generally provided specific revised text with associated comments for each of the circulated documents**,** and Taiwan provided comments to recommend either re-wording, suspending, postponing or deleting specific action items. Therefore, these three Members' proposed revisions and comments have been incorporated into **Attachments A, B** and **C** largely as provided and without the need for interpretation. However, the EU and New Zealand generally provided more overarching comments in email/letter format which the Secretariat has tried to propose revisions to address. For reference, the comments provided

by the EU and New Zealand are provided as **Attachments D** and **E** respectively.
オーストラリア及び日本は、回章された文書それぞれに対してコメントとともに具体的な修文案を提出し、台湾は特定の行動事項について文言修正、保留、延期又は削除のいずれかを求めるコメントを提出した。このため、これら 3 つのメンバーからの修正提案及びコメントについては、解釈を加えることなく**別紙 A**、**B** 及び **C** にほぼそのまま取り入れられている。しかしながら、EU 及びニュージーランドは電子メール／レターの形でより包括的なコメントを提出したので、事務局はこれに対応するための修正を試みた。参考までに、EU 及びニュージーランドから提出されたコメントを**別紙 D** 及び **E** にそれぞれ示した。

3. Consideration of Compliance Risks
遵守リスクの検討

This paper considers two items with respect to compliance risks:
本文書では、遵守リスクに関して以下の 2 つの事項を検討する。

- Proposed revisions to the list of currently agreed compliance risks (refer to section 3.1), and
  現在合意されている遵守リスク一覧に対する修正提案（セクション 3.1 を参照）
- The Secretariat's report back on what has been done to mitigate or better quantify the current list of compliance risks (refer to section 3.2 – Table 1).
  現行の遵守リスク一覧のリスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化のために為された内容に関する事務局からの報告（セクション 3.2 の表 1 を参照）

3.1 Proposed Revisions to Compliance Risks
遵守リスクに対する修正提案

As part of the intersessional process, the Secretariat circulated a document containing a proposed revised list of compliance risks.
休会期間中のプロセスの一環として、事務局は遵守リスク一覧の修正提案を含む文書を回章した。

Summary of Comments Received
受領したコメントの概要

- Australia and Japan proposed specific revisions to the risks document;
  オーストラリア及び日本は、リスクに関する文書に対する具体的な修正案を提出した。
- Taiwan did not have any objections to or propose any further updates to the revised list of compliance risks, including the proposed new risk;
  台湾は、遵守リスク一覧の修正案（提案された新たなリスクを含む）に反対せず、又はさらなるアップデートの提案も行わなかった。
- The EU provided general comments including that, "*these compliance risks do not allude to the magnitude of the non-compliance cases*" (**Attachment D**);
  EU は、「*これらの遵守リスクは、非遵守事例による影響度を示すものではない*」という内容を含む一般的なコメントを行った（**別紙 D**）。
- New Zealand provided various comments including that, *"The absence of hierarchy in the risks identified results in those risks having little influence on the subsequent 5 year Compliance Action Plan (CAP). Instead, the actions in the plan are largely opportunistic and lack an overall strategic objective.*
  From this review, it has become apparent to New Zealand that our current approach

lacks rigor and that systemic changes are necessary to meet this Commission's shared objectives as they relate to minimising the risk of non-compliance. …. The underlying issues with the CAP should, however, be looked at when conditions allow. This work would align well with item 8.2 of the Compliance Plan Strategy"
(Attachment E).
ニュージーランドは、「*特定された遵守リスクに序列がないために、これらのリスクが今後 5 年間の遵守行動計画（CAP）にほとんど影響を及ぼしていない。それどころか計画における行動事項が大幅に日和見主義的なものとなっており、また全体的な戦略目標を欠いてしまっている。ニュージーランドの観点では、委員会の現行のアプローチは厳密さを欠いており、非遵守のリスクを最小化するという委員会共通の目標を達成するためには体系的な変化が必要であることは明白である。…しかしながら、CAP の根本的な問題については状況が許す時に検討すべきである。この作業は、遵守計画の戦略項目 8.2 によく合致するものと考えられる*」という内容を含む様々なコメントを行った（**別紙 E**）。

Attachment A is a proposed revised list of compliance risks prepared after taking into account both the Secretariat's proposed revisions as well as the intersessional group's comments and revisions. Members are invited to review the revised list of compliance risks provided in this attachment.
別紙 A は、事務局の修正提案並びに休会期間中の連絡グループによるコメント及び修正の両方を踏まえて作成した遵守リスク一覧の修正案である。メンバーは同別紙に示した遵守リスク一覧の修正案についてレビューするよう招請されている。

3.2 The Secretariat's Update on Progress to Mitigate or Better Quantify Risks
リスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化の進捗状況に関する事務局のアップデート
As a standing agenda item, the Secretariat is required to report back on what has been done to mitigate or better quantify the current list of compliance risks. This information is summarised in Table 1 below and is an update of a similar table that was provided in 2019 (paper CCSBT–CC/1910/11).
常設議題項目の 1 つとして、事務局は遵守リスク一覧に掲載されたリスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化のために為された内容を報告するよう求められているところである。この情報は下表 1 にとりまとめたとおりであり、これは 2019 年に提示した類似の表（CCSBT-CC/1910/11）をアップデートしたものである。

As mentioned in section 2 of this paper, a draft of Table 1 was circulated to intersessional group members in August 2020. Only one minor comment was received (regarding bullet 1 of existing risk number 5) and that bullet point was updated accordingly.
本文書のセクション 2 でも述べたとおり、下表 1 の案は 2020 年 8 月に休会期間中の連絡グループに対して回章された。1 件のコメント（既存のリスク番号 5 の 1 ポツに関するもの）のみを受領し、それを受けて同項目をアップデートした。

Table 1
表 1

Existing Compliance Risk **既存の遵守リスク**	**Progress on Mitigating or Better Quantifying the Risk** **リスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化の進捗状況**
1. Non-compliance or incomplete implementation of the CDS CDS の非遵守又は不完全な実施	• The Secretariat provides a summary of compliance in its annual Compliance with Measures paper (CCSBT-CC15/2010/04). These analyses include an in-depth analysis of Members' compliance with the CDS as well as other requirements. The paper includes a section which highlights areas where there is persistent non-compliance. 事務局は、毎年の措置の遵守状況の概要文書を提出した（CCSBT-CC/2010/04）。これらの分析には、CDS 並びにその他の要件にかかるメンバーの遵守状況の詳細な分析が含まれる。同文書には、継続的な非遵守が発生している分野をハイライトしたセクションがある。
2. Members not fully implementing the agreed Conservation and Management Measures of the CCSBT CCSBT の合意された保存管理措置にかかるメンバーの不完全な実施	• The Secretariat has prepared its annual summaries of: 事務局は、年次概要文書として以下を作成した。 ○ the implementation of and compliance with CCSBT measures (paper CCSBT-CC15/2010/04 – refer to risk 1 above); CCSBT 措置の実施状況及び遵守状況（文書 CCSBT-CC/2010/04。上記リスク 1 を参照） ○ Members' implementation of Ecologically Related Species measures and performance with respect to ERS (CCSBT-CC15/2010/05); and メンバーの生態学的関連種に関する措置の実施状況及び ERS に関するパフォーマンス（CCSBT-CC/2010/05） ○ operation of CCSBT's measures (*e.g.* CCSBT-CC15/2010/09). CCSBT 措置の運用状況（例えば CCSBT-CC/2010/09） • During 2019, Australia, with input from Members and the Secretariat, prepared a paper for CC14 on the potential development of a more formalised CCSBT Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) for the CCSBT. During 2020 Australia convened an intersessional correspondence group to further consider the development of appropriate compliance assessment tools and processes, including the use of Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs). Australia will report back to CC15 on the progress of this group. 2019 年中、オーストラリアは、メンバー及び事務局からのインプットを得て、より公式化された CCSBT 遵守モニタリングスキーム（CMS）の策定の可能性に関する文書を CC 14 向けに作成した。2020 年中、オーストラリアは適切な遵守評価ツール及びプロセス（品質保証レビュー（QAR）の活用を含む）の策定についてさらに検討するための休会期間中の連絡グループを招集した。オーストラリアは、当該グループの進捗状況について CC 15 に報告する予定である。 • In 2020, in consultation with Members, the Secretariat prepared a proposed draft, "*Guideline on principles for action and steps to be taken in relation to extraordinary circumstances*", to help guide Members on actions and steps to be taken if extraordinary circumstances prevail, *i.e.* when rare and unpredictable events or problems prevent the normal operation of the CCSBT's measures. 2020 年において、事務局は、メンバーとの協議の下、極めて特殊な状況、すなわち希で予測不可能な事態又は問題が CCSBT 措置の

	通常の運用を阻害するような状況が発生した場合に取られるべき行動及び措置に関するメンバーの指針となる「極めて特殊な状況に関する行動原則及び取られるべき措置に関するガイドライン」案を作成した。
3. Incomplete reporting of SBT mortalities and not fully attributing all SBT mortalities (such as recreational catch, artisanal catches, discards, farm sector catches, non-farm commercial sector catches) against national allocations SBT 死亡量の不完全な報告及び国別配分量に対する SBT 死亡量（遊漁、沿岸零細漁業、投棄、蓄養セクターの漁獲量、蓄養以外の商業セクターの漁獲量）の不完全な計上	• All reported SBT mortalities (actual or estimated) have been counted against national allocations from the 2018 fishing season onwards. 2018 年漁期以降は、全報告 SBT 死亡量（実測値又は推定値）が国別配分量に対して計上されている。 • Members are reporting on actions they are taking to estimate all SBT mortalities. メンバーは、全ての SBT 死亡量を推定するために取っている行動について報告している。 • Results of a National Recreational Fishing Survey for SBT in Australia (2018/19), undertaken by the University of Tasmania for Australia, were published during 2020. オーストラリアのタスマニア大学によって実施されたオーストラリアの SBT に関する全国遊漁調査（2018／19 年）の結果が 2020 年に公開された。 • The long-standing issues relating to the farm and market anomalies were discussed with input from Farm and Market Experts at the 2019 Extended Scientific Committee (ESC 24) meeting and a number of recommendations were agreed/accepted including that: 蓄養及び市場に関するアノマリーに関する長年にわたる問題は、2019 年の拡大科学委員会（ESC）における蓄養及び市場専門家からのインプット及び以下を含む形で合意された／受け入れられた多くの勧告と合わせて検討された。 a. Australia committed to providing an update to CCSBT 27 of its activity in relation to stereo video including a “roadmap” to its implementation of stereo video, and オーストラリアは、CCSBT 27 に対し、ステレオビデオに関する同国の活動（ステレオビデオの導入に向けた「ロードマップ」を含む）にかかるアップデートを提出することを約束した。 b. Japan committed to submitting a paper to the ESC and CCSBT 27, which will include a proposal to compare Japanese market data with catch data from all Members to identify any anomalies or discrepancies. 日本は、あらゆるアノマリー又は不調和を特定するために全メンバーから得られた漁獲データを日本市場データと比較するための提案を含む文書を ESC 及び CCSBT 27 に対して提出することを約束した。 • In August 2020 Japan convened a small informal virtual workshop to discuss its market monitoring proposal. 2020 年 8 月において、日本は同国の市場モニタリング提案を検討するための小規模な非公式バーチャルワークショップを招集した。
4. Risks associated with	• In 2019, Trygg Mat Tracking (TMT) was contracted by the FAO (under the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna project) to undertake some analyses of

transhipments (both in port and at-sea), including difficulties in tracking product, preventing unauthorised introduction of product and the limitations of transhipment observers detecting infringements (including identification of SBT) when product is transhipped at-sea 転載（港内及び洋上の両方）に伴うリスク（製品の追跡の困難性、製品の無許可持込みの防止、及び洋上において製品が転載される際の違反を確認する（SBT の種同定を含む）転載オブザーバーにかかる制約を含む）	Automatic Identification System (AIS) information to improve the CCSBT's understanding of the risk of IUU SBT fishing activities occurring in SBT fishing grounds, including identifying events which may indicate that transhipments are occurring between non-CCSBT-authorised fishing vessels and authorised fishing vessels or carrier vessels (whether CCSBT-authorised or not) within SBT fishing areas. The results of these analyses were reported to CC14. Trygg Mat Tracking (TMT) は、SBT 漁場で発生している IUU SBT 漁業活動のリスクに関する CCSBT の理解を改善するための自動船舶識別装置（AIS）の一部データの解析（SBT 漁業水域における非 CCSBT 許可漁船と許可漁船又は運搬船（CCSBT の許可の有無を問わず）の間で転載が行われていることを示している可能性がある事象の特定を含む）に取り組むため、公海 ABNJ まぐろプロジェクトの下に FAO と契約した。これらの解析結果は CC 14 に対して報告された。 • Also in 2019, the Pew Charitable Trusts submitted a paper which included analyses by Global Fishing Watch (GFW) – GFW used commercially available AIS data and machine learning technology to analyse movement patterns of carrier vessels operating in CCSBT Statistical Areas (1-10, 14, 15) during calendar year 2017 and compared these data with publicly available CCSBT information on reporting of at-sea transfers of SBT to gain a better understanding of carrier vessel activity occurring in these areas, including potentially highlighting vessels that could be involved in unreported or unauthorised catches and at-sea transfers of SBT. A new analysis of 2018 data has been provided by Pew/GFW in 2020. また 2019 年には、ピュー慈善基金がグローバル・フィッシング・ウォッチ（GFW）による解析結果を含む文書を提出した。GFW は、CCSBT 統計海区（1-10, 14, 15）で行われている運搬船の活動に関するより良い理解（無報告又は無許可での SBT の漁獲及び洋上転載を含んでいる可能性がある船舶をハイライトすることを含む）を得るべく、2017 暦年に CCSBT 統計海区（1-10, 14, 15）で活動した運搬船の行動パターンを解析するために商業上利用可能な AIS データ及び機械学習テクノロジーを利用し、これらのデータを SBT の洋上転載の報告に関して公開されている CCSBT の情報と比較した。2018 年のデータにかかる新たな解析結果はピュー／GFW から 2020 年に提出されている。
5. SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species 別魚種（SBT 以外の魚種）として水揚げされる SBT	• The Secretariat maintained its relationships with a number of relevant agencies concerned with international fisheries compliance including colleagues from other RFMOs and observer organisations, particularly with respect to the operation of the transhipment observer programme. This programme is important for monitoring transhipment arrangements including that SBT is not transhipped as other species (refer to paper CCSBT-CC15/2010/13). 事務局は、国際的な漁業遵守に関する多数の関連機関（他の RFMO 及びオブザーバー機関、特に転載オブザーバー計画の運用機関の担当者を含む）との関係を維持した。同計画は、SBT が別種として転載されることがないようにすることを含む転載モニタ

	リングに関する取決めとして重要である（文書 CCSBT-CC/2020/13 を参照）。 • The Secretariat has sought updates from CSIRO regarding the feasibility and practicality of genetic testing kits. 事務局は、遺伝子テストキットの実現性及び実際性について CSIRO にアップデートを求めた。
6. Catches of SBT by Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs) 非協力的非加盟国（NCNM）による SBT の漁獲	• As above (refer to compliance risk #5) including correspondence with Namibia. ナミビアとの連絡を含め、上述のとおり（遵守リスク 5 番を参照）。 • In 2020, OMMP 11 reviewed an updated analysis of SBT catch by non-cooperating non-Members. 2020 年において、OMMP 11 は非協力的非メンバーによる SBT 漁獲量の最新の解析結果をレビューした。 • The Cape Town Procedure adopted by the Extended Commission in 2019 incorporates plausible IUU catches. Consequently, providing that unreported catch is no more than the amounts considered plausible, the MP-derived TAC can be implemented as calculated, without setting aside part of the TAC to account for IUU catch. 2019 年に拡大委員会が採択したケープタウン方式は、妥当な水準の IUU 漁獲量を取り込んでいる。このため、無報告漁獲量が妥当と考えられる数量を上回らない限りは、IUU 漁獲量を考慮するために TAC の一部を控除することなく、MP が勧告した TAC を計算結果のまま使用することができる。
7. Expansion of markets for SBT that are not cooperating with the provisions of the CCSBT's CDS CCSBT の CDS 文書の提出に協力しない SBT 市場の拡大	• The Secretariat is now using COMTRADE to check trade statistics (it previously used the Global Trade Atlas database). Between 2012 to 2019 inclusive, the Secretariat provided an annual summary of trade data available for the preceding three calendar years. 事務局は、現在、貿易統計の確認に COMTRADE を利用している（以前はグローバル・トレード・アトラスデータベースを利用していた）。2012 年から 2019 年まで、事務局は過去 3 暦年に関して利用可能な貿易データの年次サマリーを提出した。 • The Secretariat continues to contact some Members and non-Members to seek further information on trade data and/or advising about the requirements of CCSBT's CDS (*e.g.* Canada, Lebanon, Mauritius, Namibia and the USA) 事務局は、貿易データに関する追加情報を要請するため、及び／又は CCSBT の CDS 要件について伝達するために一部のメンバー及び非メンバー（例えばカナダ、レバノン、モーリシャス、ナミビア及び米国）と引き続き連絡をとっている。
8. Incomplete or inaccurate reporting of non-SBT bycatches, including seabirds SBT 以外の種（海鳥を含む）の混獲にかかる不完全又は不正確な報告	• In 2018 additional mitigation measure checks and reporting requirements were included within Annex B (inspection reporting form) of The Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port, however little new information has been collected to date from this inclusion. 2018 年に港内検査の最低基準を定めた CCSBT 制度に関する決議の別添 B（検査報告書様式）に混獲緩和措置の確認及び報告要件が追加されたが、これを通じて今日までに収集された新情報は乏しい。 • In 2019, ERSWG 13 recommended improving the spatial and temporal resolution of data captured in the ERSWG Data Exchange template and also agreed in-principle support of a joint BirdLife/CCSBT Secretariat

	proposal, "to enhance the implementation of ERS measures through outreach/education and to verify compliance with measures", that was requested by CC 13. During 2020 the intersessional seabird correspondence group, under the leadership of BirdLife International, has continued to further develop this project proposal for CC15's consideration. 2019年のERSWG 13は、ERSWGデータ交換テンプレートにおける捕獲データの空間的・時間的解像度を改善するよう勧告し、またCC 13からの要請であった「アウトリーチ／教育活動を通じたERS措置の実施の強化及び措置の遵守状況の確認のための」バードライフ／CCSBT事務局による合同提案を原則的に支持することに合意した。2020年の休会期間中の海鳥連絡グループは、バードライフ・インターナショナルによるリーダーシップの下、CC 15による検討に向けて当該プロジェクト提案のさらなる策定作業を継続した。
9. Limited ability of some RFMOs to share relevant compliance information with each other due to confidentiality constraints and/or lack of relevant data exchange/ cooperation agreements 機密上の制約及び／又は関連するデータ交換／協力協定がないことによる、一部のRFMOとの関連する遵守情報の相互共有にかかる限定的な能力	• The adopted Transhipment Letter of Understanding between the CCSBT and the IOTC[5] should facilitate improved sharing of all transhipment observer programme information between the two RFMOs. CCSBTとIOTC[5]との間で採択された転載に関する基本合意書は、2つのRFMO間での全転載オブザーバー計画情報の共有の改善を促進するものと考えられる。
10. Limited information regarding fleet compliance with respect to binding and recommendatory ERS measures 法的拘束力のある及び勧告されているERS措置に関する船団の遵守状況にかか	• CCSBT adopted the Resolution to Align CCSBT's Ecologically Related Species measures with those of other tuna RFMOs in October 2018. It includes a requirement for the Secretariat to annually present a report to the CC on Members' implementation of ERS measures which commenced in 2019. This year's report will be presented in paper CCSBT-CC15/2010/05) and will improve overall transparency of implementation in this area. CCSBTは、2018年にCCSBTの生態学的関連種に関する措置を他のRFMOの措置と調和させるための決議を採択した。同決議には、事務局がCCに対してメンバーのERS措置の実施状況に関する報告書を毎年提出するとの要件があり、2019年から開始されている。本年の報告書は文書CCSBT-CC/2010/05として提出される予

[5] The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission インド洋まぐろ類委員会

る限定的な情報	定であり、この分野の実施状況にかかる全体的な透明性を高めるものと考えられる。 • In 2019, ERSWG 13 recommended improving the information on usage of seabird mitigation measures and the spatial and temporal resolution of data captured in the ERSWG Data Exchange template. 2019 年において、ERSWG 13 は、海鳥混獲緩和措置の使用状況に関する情報及び ERSWG データ交換テンプレートで捕捉されるデータの空間的・時間的解像度の改善を勧告した。

4. Consideration of CAP Project and Maintenance Action Items
CAP のプロジェクト行動事項及び「維持管理」行動事項の検討

In 2019, the Secretariat presented some preliminary ideas about items to include within a new 2021 – 2025 CAP to CC14 (paper CCSBT–CC/1910/11), however no recommendations resulted.
2019 年において、事務局は CC 14 に対して 2021－2025 年の新たな CAP に取り入れる事項に関するいくらかの予備的なアイデアを提示したが、勧告は行われなかった。

In order to commence intersessional consultations with Members during 2020, the Secretariat again identified a number of proposed action items that could be included within the next CAP for 2021 – 2025. The structure/ action items in tables 1 and 2 of the current 2018-20 CAP were used as a base, especially for the maintenance action items, which tend to change very little from year to year. In addition, proposed action items were drawn from ideas already discussed or previously presented to CC14 (paper CCSBT–CC/1910/11), and/or items included within the summary of possible future actions that Australia provided to the Compliance Assessment Process intersessional correspondence group in May 2020.
2020 年にメンバーとの休会期間中の協議を開始することができるよう、事務局は 2021－2025 年の次期 CAP に取り入れることが考えられる多数の行動事項案を改めて特定した。現行の 2018－2020 年の CAP における表 1 及び表 2 の構成／行動事項をベースとして用い、特に年ごとにほとんど変化しない「維持管理」行動事項についてはそのまま利用した。さらに、提案されている行動事項は、CC 14 で既に検討又は説明されたアイデア（文書 CCSBT-CC/1910/11）及び／又はオーストラリアが 2020 年 5 月に遵守評価プロセスに関する休会期間中の連絡グループに対して提示した将来的な行動の概要に含まれていた事項から引用したものである。

These Secretariat-proposed action items were sent to intersessional group participants for comment during May 2020. The Secretariat then collated the feedback received from the group's participants into **Attachments B** (Table 1 - Project action items) and **C** (Table 2 - Maintenance action items).
事務局が提案したこれらの行動事項は、2020 年 5 月に休会期間中のグループ参加者によるコメントを得るべく送付された。その後、事務局はグループ参加者から受領したフィードバックを**別紙 B**（表 1－プロジェクト行動事項）及び**別紙 C**（表 2－「維持管理」行動事項）のとおり取りまとめた。

The following summaries explain the various colour-coding and revisions found within **Attachments B** and **C**.
以下の概要は、別紙 B 及び C における様々なカラーコード及び修正について説明したものである。

Attachment B: Elements provided to intersessional group participants for comment
別紙 B：休会期間中の連絡グループ参加者によるコメントを求めて提供された内容

- Green text (not tracked)
  緑色のテキスト（見え消しではない）
  Items carried over from the previous CAP without revision or with minor editorial revisions;
  以前の CAP から修正無く又は編集上の微修正を加えて持ち越されてきた事項
- Red text (not tracked)
  赤色のテキスト（見え消しではない）
  Items listed in the CC14 report (paragraph 86) that were discussed and identified as potential project action item areas to include within the new CAP;
  次期 CAP に取り入れる可能性があるプロジェクト行動事項の分野として検討及び特定された、CC 14 報告書（パラグラフ 86）に列記された事項
- Blue text (not tracked)
  青色のテキスト（見え消しではない）
  This text was taken from the summary of possible future actions provided by Australia to the Compliance Assessment Process intersessional correspondence group (email dated 5 May 2020).
  遵守評価プロセスに関する休会期間中の連絡グループに対してオーストラリアが提示した将来的な行動の概要（2020 年 5 月 5 日付け電子メール）から引用した文言
- Black text
  黒色のテキスト
  Any other items added by the Secretariat for participants' consideration.
  参加者による検討に向けて事務局が追加したその他全ての事項

Attachment C: Elements provided to intersessional group participants for comment
別紙 C：休会期間中の連絡グループ参加者によるコメントを求めて提供された内容

- Black text
  黒色のテキスト
  Text from the existing 2018 – 2020 CAP which was used as a base for the maintenance action items.
  「維持管理」行動事項のベースとして用いた既存の 2018－2020 年の CAP から引き継いだ文言

- Red text (not tracked)
  赤色のテキスト（見え消しではない）
  Revisions previously proposed to the maintenance action items in paper CCSBT–CC/1910/11 (CC14) – no recommendation was made on these by CC14 and so these items are re-included for CC15's consideration.
  文書 CCSBT-CC/1910/11（CC 14 文書）において以前に提案された「維持管理」行動事項の修正－CC 14 によって勧告はされなかったので、CC 15 による検討のために再度記載したもの。
- Blue text (not tracked)
  青色のテキスト（見え消しではない）
  This text was taken from the summary of possible future actions provided by Australia to the Compliance Assessment Process intersessional correspondence group (email dated 5 May 2020), except for the proposed revision to action item number 20 which was suggested by the Secretariat.
  遵守評価プロセスに関する休会期間中の連絡グループに対してオーストラリアが提示した将来的な行動の概要（2020 年 5 月 5 日付け電子メール）から引用した文言（ただし事務局が提案した行動事項番号 20 に対する修正提案は除く）

Attachments B & C: Tracked revisions proposed by intersessional group participants
別紙 B 及び C：休会期間中の連絡グループ参加者から提案された見え消し修正

- All of the tracked revisions reflect revisions or suggestions provided by intersessional group participants:
  全ての「見え消し修正」は、休会期間中の連絡グループ参加者による修正又は提案を反映したものである。
  a) Revisions linked to comments labelled, "MemberRev":
     「MemberRev」とラベルが付けられたコメントに関連する修正
     These are generally specific text revisions that were proposed by various Members. The comment boxes note which Member proposed the revisions and any other relevant information, and
     様々なメンバーから提案された具体的な文言修正である。コメントボックスでは、どのメンバーが修正を提案したのか、及びその他の関連情報を述べている。
  b) Revisions linked to comments labelled, "Add Prop":
     「Add prop」とラベルが付けられたコメントに関連する修正：
     These revisions were added by the Secretariat to take into account more general comments made by various Members.
     様々なメンバーからのより一般的なコメントを考慮して事務局が追加した修正である。

Note that the EU commented that:
EU は以下のとおりコメントしたことに留意されたい：
"*…. we believe that the Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) could be revised*".
「*最低履行要件（MPR）も修正されるものと考える。*」
Maintenance action item 16b already provides for maintenance and enhancement of the existing MPRs and so the Secretariat did not propose any additional revisions to address this comment.

「維持管理」行動事項の 16b は既存の MPR の管理及び強化について既に規定しているため、事務局は同コメントに対応するための追加修正は提案しなかった。

5. Recommendations

勧告

CC15 is invited to consider:

CC 15 は以下を検討するよう招請されている。

- The progress made on mitigating or better quantifying existing compliance risks summarised by the Secretariat in Table 1; and
  事務局が表 1 として取りまとめた既存の遵守リスクの緩和又はさらなる定量化に関する進捗状況

To consider and revise as appropriate:

以下を検討し、必要に応じて修正すること：

- The list of compliance risks (**Attachment A)** to include within the 2021 - 2025 CAP;
  2021－2025 年の CAP に含める遵守リスク一覧（別紙 A）
- The project action items (**Attachment B**) to include within the 2021 - 2025 CAP;
  2021－2025 年の CAP に含めるプロジェクト行動事項（別紙 B）
- The maintenance action items (**Attachment C**) to include within the 2021 - 2025 CAP.
  2021－2025 年の CAP に含める「維持管理」行動事項

Prepared by the Secretariat

事務局作成文書

List of Compliance Risks: Extracted from page 1 of the Current Compliance Action Plan
(including proposed revisions and annotations)

Explanatory Notes

There are two sets of proposed revisions

1. Revisions that are not tracked but which are shown as yellow-highlighted text:
   These are revisions to the list of compliance risks that were proposed by the Secretariat and circulated to intersessional group participants in May 2020. They have been accepted in the document below and are highlighted (in yellow). These proposed revisions included one additional risk (appears as risk 9) added by the Secretariat which recognises risks associated with extraordinary circumstances;

2. Tracked revisions (in 2 different colours) associated with comments:
   a. ***Specific revisions proposed by Members during the intersessional consultation process***
      These are revisions linked to comments labelled "MemberRev". These revisions were proposed by Australia and Japan and are tracked in one colour. The comment boxes note which of these two Members proposed the revisions and any other relevant information.

   b. ***Revisions that have been added by the Secretariat to try to take into account Members' suggestions received during the intersessional consultation process in cases where the Member did not propose specific text revisions***
      These revisions are linked to comments labelled, "Add Prop" and take into account the more generalised comments made by the EU and to a larger extent New Zealand.

Proposed Revisions to Compliance Risks

In October 2010 the Extended Commission (EC) agreed that the Compliance Plan should place special emphasis on managing specific compliance risks identified by the Compliance Committee on the basis of a risk assessment.

Previous meetings of the Compliance Committee have identified and reviewed the list of agreed compliance risks that should be considered when developing successive Compliance Action Plans (CAPs). When assessing compliance risks, lack of or insufficient information may prevent the relative impact of different risks from being well understood. Examples of such information constraints could include:

- Limited availability of information regarding fleet compliance with binding measures, and
- The limited ability of some RFMOs to share relevant compliance information with each other due to confidentiality constraints and/or lack of relevant data exchange/ cooperation agreements.

~~t~~The currently agreed list of compliance risks ~~are listed below~~ has not been prioritised and is therefore provided below in no particular order. However, as a general principle, risks that are assessed as more likely to have a greater adverse impact on SBT stock status and/or associated species and ecosystems, should be considered higher priority risks~~in no particular order~~:

1) Non-compliance or incomplete implementation of the CDS;
   ~~Members not fully implementing the agreed Conservation and Management Measures of the CCSBT;~~

2) Incomplete reporting of SBT mortalities and not fully attributing all SBT mortalities (such as recreational catch, artisanal catches, discards, and discard mortality estimates, farm sector catches, non-farm commercial sector catches) against national allocations;

3) Risks associated with transhipments (both in port and at-sea), including difficulties in tracking product, preventing unauthorised introduction of product and the limitations of transhipment observers detecting infringements (including identification of SBT) when product is transhipped at-sea;

Commented [Add Prop1]: (Secretariat moved text in response to NZ comments)

These 2 items were previously labelled risk #s 9 and 10 have been moved (with editorial changes) to the introductory paragraphs as examples of potential constraints.

Commented [Add Prop2]: (Secretariat revisions in response to EU and NZ comments)

This new sentence tries to take into account the points about risk assessment (NZ)/ magnitude of non-compliance (EU)

Commented [Add Prop3]: (Secretariat deletion in response to NZ comments)

This risk (previously numbered as risk 2) has been deleted at NZ's suggestion due to its generic nature
(NZ's second option was that the risk could be refined by the group)

Commented [MemberRev4]: (AU proposed revision)

4) Dependence of some CCSBT measures upon the successful administration and implementation of similar measures in other RFMOs, *e.g.* CCSBT's Transhipment and VMS Resolutions - compliance can only be determined by adequate information exchange between CCSBT and the other RFMOs involved;

5) Misreporting, including SBT being landed as other (non SBT) species;

6) Catches of SBT by Non-Cooperating Non-Members (NCNMs);

7) Expansion of markets for SBT that are not cooperating with the provisions of the CCSBT's CDS;

8) Incomplete or inaccurate reporting of non-SBT bycatches, including seabirds; and

~~Limited ability of some RFMOs to share relevant compliance information with each other due to confidentiality constraints and/or lack of relevant data exchange/ cooperation agreements; and~~

~~Limited information regarding fleet compliance with respect to binding and recommendatory ERS measures; and~~

9) Operational difficulties caused by ~~E~~extraordinary~~ceptional~~ circumstances ~~such as the COVID-19 pandemic may~~ ~~that~~ ~~cause operational difficulties with~~may adversely affect the implementation of and adherence to CCSBT conservation and management measures.

Commented [Add Prop5]: (Secretariat addition in response to NZ comments)

NZ noted CCSBT's reliance on other RFMOs for some obligations could be a new 'stand-alone' risk.

Commented [MemberRev6]: (AU proposed revision)

Commented [Add Prop7]: (Secretariat moved text in response to NZ comments)

These 2 items were previously labelled risk #s 9 and 10 have been moved to the introductory paragraphs as examples of potential constraints.

Commented [MemberRev8]: (JP proposed revision including minor editorial amendments made by the Secretariat)

The Secretariat added in the text "may adversely affect" and re-ordered the text to reflect comments from Japan.

Commented [Add Prop9]: (Secretariat revisions in response to NZ comments)

"Exceptional" amended to "extraordinary", and the specific reference to COVID-19 was deleted.

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.								
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
8.2 Develop and implement MCS strategy	**1**	To help focus the work of the Compliance Committee (CC): • ~~Identify CCSBT's high priority Conservation and Management Measures for which compliance is essential, and~~ • Review areas of greatest compliance risk in order to facilitate a consistent and coordinated approach to compliance/MCS planning.	Members	**On-going**				
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	**2a**	CDS Resolution/electronic CDS (eCDS): a) Examine the prototype eCDS based on the 2014 (revised in 2019) CDS Resolution.	Members/ Secretariat					
	2b	b) Determine whether to proceed with the eCDS, while addressing unresolved issues in the 2014 (revised in 2019) CDS Resolution, and if ~~so~~proceeding, specify the timeframe for finalising development, testing and implementation.	Members/ Secretariat					
	2c	c) Finalisation of development, testing and Implementation of eCDS.	Members/ Secretariat		?	?	?	?
	3a	VMS Resolution: The CCSBT considered some options to strengthen its VMS arrangements and is waiting for the outcomes of the IOTC and its VMS Working Group's work before further considering any changes to its own VMS arrangements. Next steps are: a) Monitor and report back on the IOTC's (e.g. the VMS Working Group's) progress on considering options to strengthen the IOTC's VMS; and	Members/ Secretariat					

Commented [MemberRev1]: (JP) Deletion proposed by Japan with the comment:
"As Japan stated in its comments to questionnaire from Australia, prioritization of CMMs is not necessary."

Commented [MemberRev2]: (JP) Addition proposed by Japan with the comment:
"Added based on para 43 of CCSBT 26 Report."

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued) Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.								
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	**3b**	b) If the IOTC strengthens its VMS arrangements, then review and potentially revise CCSBT's own VMS arrangements/ Resolution(s) to strengthen them to align them with any changes in the IOTC's VMS arrangements.	Members/ Secretariat					
	4	Follow up on any agreed farm and market recommendations as appropriate e.g. Australia's plan on its efforts to implement Stereo Video, Japan's proposal on market monitoring for catch verification of all Members, both of which are to be presented to CCSBT27.	Members/ Secretariat					
	5	The next Performance Review of the CCSBT is scheduled for 2021. Consider and review any compliance recommendations made by the 2021 CCSBT Performance Review (PR) Panel and: • Advise on which compliance related PR recommendations should be adopted by the CCSBT and once adopted, include these in the CC's next annual Workplan and/or the CAP as appropriate, and • Clearly record, with reasons, those compliance-related PR recommendations that have not been recommended for adoption.	Members/ Secretariat					
	6	To assist with the detection of potential IUU activity, use, "AIS and other data ~~to help detect~~focusing on vessels that are not authorised to relevant RFMOs, not transmitting on VMS, not complying with transhipment requirements and/or not subject to any known management and reporting processes."[1]	Members/ Secretariat					

[1] Refer to paragraph 86, dotpoint 1 of the CC14 report

Commented [MemberRev3]: (JP) Addition proposed by Japan with the comment:
"Added based on para 85 and 86 of CCSBT26 Report."

Commented [Add Prop4]: Revision proposed by the Secretariat to address the comment made by Taiwan that:
"We prefer to quoting the 86, 1) of CC14 report."

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.

Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	**7**	Electronic observation technologies: Consider ~~and~~ setting standards for the use of electronic observation technologies for the future, e.g. to use as a backup technology in exceptional circumstances where measures such as the scientific or transhipment observer programs cannot be undertaken by humans, and/or for more routine use ~~e.g. as part of~~to partially or wholly replace or supplement the regular Scientific Observer Program. Relevant e-monitoring discussions and decisions made in other RFMOs (e.g. WCPFC) should be taken into account to ensure that consistent standards are developed between RFMOs.	Members/ Secretariat					
	8a	a) Continue to consider options to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures, including during inspections in port (Members) and as part of the transhipment observation program	Members/ Secretariat					
	~~**8b**~~	b) ~~Identify and action opportunities to enhance education on and implementation of Ecologically Related Species (ERS) measures for seabirds and for other ERS.~~	~~Members/ Secretariat~~					
8.5 Sharing compliance data	**9**	Review the operation of the Compliance Policy Guideline 4 - MCS Information Collection and Sharing. This policy is required to be reviewed by 2024 at the latest, unless the Commission directs it be reviewed earlier. CC14 considered it important to review the operation of the new sharing process after being triggered to ensure that it is working efficiently.	Members/ Secretariat					

Commented [MemberRev5]: (JP) Revisions proposed by Japan with the comment:
"Because EM is not an observer"

Commented [MemberRev6]: (TW) Taiwan proposed suspending this item:
"Since our electronic observation technology is still in the immature stage, it cannot work as a backup technology to us. We recommend suspending this Item."
The Secretariat has modified the timeframe to indicate that work on this item could be postponed until at least 2024 (it was previously proposed to commence in 2022) which might address Taiwan's comments.
The Secretariat has retained Japan's proposed revised text in the interim so that CC15 can consider this item in light of the proposed revisions.

Commented [Add Prop7]: Timeframe revision proposed by the Secretariat (amended from 2021-2022 to 2023-2025) to try to address Taiwan's proposal to postpone this item.
Taiwan's comment was:
"Since the Resolution for a CCSBT Scheme for Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port was revised in 2018 to change the format of reporting seabird mitigation measures inspection, we believe that it is appropriate to spend some time in confirming how the resolution works after the revision. Therefore there is no need to discuss this item until then. In addition, what the ROP observers should focus at sea is transhipment rather than the implementation of seabird mitigation measures. We suggest postponing this item."

Commented [MemberRev8]: (TW) Deletion proposed by Taiwan with the comment:
"*Since the BL project is still under an intersessional discussion and its funding and future path have not been determined yet, it's inappropriate to include this item in a 5-year CAP at the moment."*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued)
Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.

Compliance Plan Strategy No.	Item Number	Priority Actions	Responsibility	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
8.7 Research & development	**10**	Regular report-backs on Research and Development on new technologies & tools to aid observers, certifiers, and validators to identify SBT (in particular once processed) to be provided by Members, in particular developments in the effectiveness and availability of practical on-site genetic testing kits for tuna species identification	Members/ Secretariat					
8.7 Research & development	**11a**	a) Investigate methods to improve estimation of catches by Non-Members ~~and ways to minimise Non-Member catch~~	Members					
	11b	b) If appropriate methods are identified in a) above, then: • produce improved estimates of Non-member catch~~, and/or~~ • ~~develop a policy guideline on ways to minimise Non-member catch~~.	Members/ Secretariat					

Commented [MemberRev9]: (TW) Taiwan commented that:
"As we have not developed new technologies and tools to identify SBT, it is difficult for us to regularly report-backs on Research and Development on new technologies and tools."

Commented [MemberRev10]: Deletion proposed by Japan and NZ:
(JP) Deletion proposed by JP with the comment that:
"This is matter of the Commission; beyond the Compliance Committee's capacity."

(NZ) Deletion proposed by NZ with the comment:
"Under 11a, minimising Non-Member catch is not within the mandate of CCSBT and potentially not in keeping with certain international law principles. Rather, our focus should be on creating incentives for Non-Members to support our existing systems (e.g. through better reporting and cooperation with the CDS). The CCSBT Convention has articles that balance the need to encourage cooperation and membership (Article 13) and to discourage activities that are deemed to be to the detriment of our shared objectives (Article 15) but the CAP appears to only focus on the latter."

Commented [MemberRev11]: (JP, NZ) Deletion proposed by Japan and NZ with the same comments as for action item 11a.

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 9— Members' obligations All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.								
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
9.1 Auditing Members' systems and processes	**12a**	a) Review the outcomes of the first round of Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs): • with respect to compliance risks, both for individual Members, and for particular obligations, • the utility~~value~~ of the information obtained and any remedial actions taken by Members, and • decide whether to continue the QAR program.	Members/ Secretariat					
	12b	b) If agreed to continue the QAR program, develop and agree a plan for future QARs including revised terms of reference, which could involve a series of predefined QARs or running QARs on an ad hoc basis to address specific compliance issues for either all or selected Members.	Members/ Secretariat					
	12c	c) If agreed to continue the QAR program, review and revise the QAR terms of reference as appropriate, including defining a concise format for the presentation of future QAR executive summary information.	Members/ Secretariat					
9.2 Corrective action and remedies	**13**	Review CPG3, the Corrective Actions Policy which is to be reviewed every five years (due in 2023) unless requested earlier.	Members/ Secretariat					

Commented [MemberRev12]: (AU) Revision proposed by Australia

Commented [Add Prop13]: Addition proposed by the Secretariat to try to address a point raised by the EU.

Table 1: CAP Project Action Items *continued*

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission's management measures and other requirements.						
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**
10.1 Compliance Assistance	**14**	Targeted analysis of capacity building needs and identify any necessary Compliance "missions" to assist developing State Members. Direction may be provided by the QAR process.	Members/ Secretariat	As requested		

Commented [MemberRev14]: (AU) Addition proposed by Australia

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**
8.1 Implementing agreed MCS measures	**15**	Continue to implement adopted Resolutions and Decisions	Members/ Secretariat
	16a	Maintain and enhance: a) the agreed list of conservation and management measures	Members/ Secretariat
	16b	b) the ~~already developed~~ Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs), in particular the Routine Reporting Measures as existing Resolutions are revised, as well as developing new MPRs for any newly adopted Resolutions ~~(e.g. the Resolution on large-scale driftnet fishing)~~	Members/ Secretariat
	16c	c) the associated consolidated ~~national report~~ template for the Annual Report to the Compliance Committee and the Extended Commission in which Members report their performance against the obligations and agreed MPRs	Members/ Secretariat
	~~16d~~	~~d) provide recommendations to the ESC and ERSWG for changes to their reporting templates as new compliance requirements emerge~~	~~Members/ Secretariat~~
	17	Performance reporting system in place (the Secretariat's Compliance with Measures and Operation of CCSBT Measures reports and/or any agreed Compliance Monitoring Scheme)	Secretariat
8.3 Strengthen compliance (MCS systems and services)	**18**	Maintain and strengthen relationships with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and international networks (such as the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network and the Tuna Compliance Network)	Secretariat

Commented [MemberRev1]: (TW) Deletion proposed by Taiwan with the comment that:

"Since ESC and ERSWG evaluate fishery resources and bycatch of ecological related species from the scientific perspective to provide recommendations to CC or EC for review, it may not be suitable to change the ESC and ERSWG report format for compliance purpose. We hope the Secretariat can delete item 16d."

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 8 – Monitoring, control, and surveillance (continued) Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**
8.4 Monitoring expansion of SBT markets	**19**	Regular monitoring for emerging SBT markets, including reviews and trend analysis of SBT trade/market data.	Members/ Secretariat
8.5 Sharing compliance data	**20**	Encourage sharing of information in accordance with the CCSBT's MCS Information Collection and Sharing Policy (Compliance Policy Guideline 4). For example, ~~S~~share catch and effort data, and any other available information/ intelligence that will assist with the identification of IUU fishing	Members/ Secretariat - as required
8.6 Secretariat MCS Services	**21a**	Analyse MCS data and report on trends (annually), as well as assessing the effectiveness of MCS measures based on the data submitted. These analyses should include an annual summary of any non-compliance detected with respect to the collection and provision of non-SBT bycatch information. The Secretariat should identify and record areas of persistent non-compliance by individual Members in its annual report to the CC.	Members/ Secretariat
	21b	Formally record any cases of Member non-compliance that require improvement or corrective action - there is a standing agenda item on the Compliance Committee agenda for identifying such non-compliance: • Record causes of non-compliance and actions proposed by Members to address non-compliance, including identifying timeframes within which corrective actions are to be completed; and • Review Members' progress against proposed actions and timeframes to ensure that progress is monitored and corrective action completed.	Members/ Secretariat
	22	Ensure all transhipment observers are trained in CCSBT obligations (in the event that SBT is involved), including any cross-endorsed WCPFC ROP transhipment observers	Secretariat

Commented [MemberRev2]: (JP) Deletion of item 21b proposed by Japan with the comment that:
"This is inconsistent with Japan's comments "As substance of follow-up action has been already covered by discussion on application of the Corrective Actions and the workplan section of the CC report, Japan does not find necessity to establish an additional new process specialized for follow-up action" which Japan separately submitted to Australia."

This item has been left in the plan for CC15 to discuss since Australia has suggested a revision to this item.

Commented [MemberRev3]: (AU) Addition proposed by Australia.

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 9— Members' obligations All Members comply with rules of CCSBT.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**
9.2 Corrective action and remedies	**23**	Update CCSBT's public website with details of any instances of non-compliance with a Member's/CNM's allocation of the global SBT TAC~~,~~ and any other non-trivial instances of non-compliance with CCSBT obligations where corrective action has been specified[1], and the corrective action(s) that was/were taken by the Member/ CNM concerned	Secretariat

Goal 10: Supporting developing countries Developing country Members and Cooperating Non-Members are able to comply with the Commission's management measures and other requirements.			
CCSBT Strategic Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**
10.1 Compliance Assistance	**24**	Ongoing identification and sharing of best practice and information for MCS systems	Members/ Secretariat

[1] The text, "other non-trivial instances of non-compliance with CCSBT obligations where corrective action has been specified", is from CCSBT's CPG3 Corrective Actions Policy: section 5, number 5, dotpoint 2.

Commented [Add Prop4]: (Sec) Additional footnote proposed by the Secretariat for clarification.

The explanatory footnote comes directly from CCSBT's CPG3 Corrective Actions Policy: section 5. number 5, dotpoint 2, and has been added for clarification based on some initial comments made by Australia and Japan.

Table 2: CAP Annual Ongoing Maintenance Action Items *continued*

Goal 11: Participation in the CCSBT Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements.			
Compliance Plan Strategy No.	**Item Number**	**Priority Actions**	**Responsibility**
11.1 Inclusive cooperation	**25**	Identify (using trade and market analyses~~)~~, as well as any other information supplied by Members or non-members, e.g. evidence of IUU SBT fishing~~)~~, non-member port and market States whose cooperation should be sought	Members/ Secretariat
	26	As appropriate, nominate such States to the Commission	Members/ Secretariat

Commented [MemberRev5]: (AU) Addition proposed by Australia.

Comments on the CAP from the EU

Thank you for this consultation and for the revised documents concerning the new CAP. We have the following comments and suggestions on the Attachment A, B and C:

- Attachment A: the list of compliance risks is OK for us. However, these compliance risks do not allude to the magnitude of the non-compliance cases. In fact, I believe that the extend of any unconformity and its possible impact in the sustainability of the stock and ecosystems should be take into account. It is completely different when non-compliance leads to major errors or to a significant impact in the stock and ecosystems - for instance, in accounted mortalities or market misreporting - than when these problems are marginal and have no impact.
- Attachment B: we are also OK with the amendments proposed. Nevertheless, it could be interesting to explore the possibility to include also a strategy leading to a re-arrangement of any piece of legislation (CMM) whenever it look necessary to pragmatically match a CMM to the reality of the fisheries (obviously I am mainly referring to the EU fleets). With regard to the QAR we also believe that it is opportune to develop and agree a plan for future QARs review and revise the QAR terms of reference as appropriate to each Member.
- Attachment C: We are also OK with new proposed text. Moreover, we believe that the Minimum Performance Requirements (MPRs) could be revised. In fact, the MPR is a good and exhaustive guiding document but sometimes looks a bidding reference more stringent than CMMs and not necessarily reflecting the reality and conditions of all fisheries and fleets. This is maybe something that could be developed alongside with the need to take in to account specificities of each Member.

A final comment relates to the need that new CMM, particularly concerning future/new MCS systems. I could be important to take into account the legislation in force and lessons learned in other tRFMO or even promote common working groups with these organisations. The cases related to electronic monitoring and reporting, VMS, AIS and electronic CDS could be adopted and implemented in parallel with other organisations (ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC).

Comments on the CAP from New Zealand

Thank you for your efforts in coordinating this working group. New Zealand places a high degree of importance on ensuring that CCSBT systems are robust and limit the potential for non-compliant activity to undermine the sacrifices made to date by all members. In reviewing the current documents, New Zealand is mindful of the guidance provided in the introductory section of the List of Compliance Risks, which states that "special emphasis be placed on managing specific compliance risks identified by the Compliance Committee on the basis of a risk assessment". New Zealand strongly supports an approach that is based on a risk assessment but struggles to reconcile that approach with the current exercise where compliance risks are listed "in no particular order".

New Zealand believes that the lack of focus or underlying risk assessment in the current approach severely undermines the value of this review. This Commission, like other RFMOs, is constrained by the limited resources that it can apply to mitigate risks and the lack of prioritisation here increases the likelihood of our limited resources being misallocated. The absence of hierarchy in the risks identified results in those risks having little influence on the subsequent 5 year Compliance Action Plan (CAP). Instead, the actions in the plan are largely opportunistic and lack an overall strategic objective.

From this review, it has become apparent to New Zealand that our current approach lacks rigor and that systemic changes are necessary to meet this Commission's shared objectives as they relate to minimising the risk of non-compliance. However, New Zealand appreciates that the circumstances dictated to us because of the global pandemic will make it difficult for members to engage in such a fundamental shift and accepts that a more simplistic review may be more appropriate in the current year. The underlying issues with the CAP should, however, be looked at when conditions allow. This work would align well with item 8.2 of the Compliance Plan Strategy, which currently has no defined timing.

In terms of comments on individual items, New Zealand would like to suggest the following changes to the List of Compliance Risks:

- The second risk is incredibly broad to the point where it does not aid in the development of the CAP. Suggest this could be deleted or will need to be refined by the group.
- Risk 9 and 10 are constraints rather than a risks in themselves. Constraints such as these limit our ability to assess the level of risk and/or develop effective mitigation strategies. Under a more formal review process, items such as these would provide the link between the prioritised risks and the actions identified in the CAP.
- The term "exceptional circumstances" has existing connotations within CCSBT that don't necessarily align to the circumstances described here. Suggest using another term and removing reference to COVID-19 to future-proof the statement.
- The CCSBT's recent experience with COVID-19 has highlighted the reliance on other RFMOs for certain obligations (i.e. observer services) and that is potentially worth listing as a standalone risk.

Here is an additional suggested edit for the CAP:

- Under 11a, minimising Non-Member catch is not within the mandate of CCSBT and potentially not in keeping with certain international law principles. Rather, our focus should be on creating incentives for Non-Members to support our existing systems (e.g. through better reporting and cooperation with the CDS). The CCSBT Convention has articles that balance the need to encourage cooperation and membership (Article 13) and to discourage activities that are deemed to be to the detriment of our shared objectives (Article 15) but the CAP appears to only focus on the latter.

Thank you again for your work to date …..